



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/534,773

05/13/2005

John Forsyth Robertson

49409-0041 (315804)

1789

23370 7590 06/01/2009

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1643

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/534,773	Applicant(s) ROBERTSON ET AL.	
	Examiner LYNN BRISTOL	Art Unit 1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 15-18 and 39-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12 and 39-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/13/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-18 and 39-44 are all the pending claims for this application.
2. Claims 15 -18 are withdrawn from examination.
3. Claims 1, 3-8, 11, and 12 were amended and new claims 39-44 were added in the Response of 3/5/09.
4. Claims 1-8, 11, 12 and 39-44 are all the pending claims under examination.
5. Applicants amendments to the claims have necessitated new grounds for rejection. This rejection is FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The IDS of 1/13/09 has been considered and entered. Those references for which copies were not provided have been stricken on the 1449 form. The signed and initialed 1449 form is attached.
7. The information disclosure statement filed 4/23/09 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it does not contain a 1449 form listing the references. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the

Art Unit: 1643

time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Rejections Maintained

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. The rejection of Claims 1-7 (and new Claims 39, 41 and 44) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanash et al. (WO 00/26668; published 5/11/2000; cited in the IDS of 12/14/06) is maintained.

New Claims 39, 41 and 44 are joined under the rejection and are interpreted as being drawn to the method where the tumor marker protein is isolated by protein purification techniques (Claim 39) and where the isolated antibody is substantially free from immunoglobulin (Claim 41), and where the bodily fluid is produced as a result of the disease process or presence of cancer cells (Claim 44).

The rejection was maintained in the Office Action of 10/1/08 as follows:

"Applicants' allegations on pp. 7-8 of the Response have been considered but are not found persuasive. Applicants allege the method requires "that the tumor marker proteins must be from a particular source, namely, the sample being tested for autoantibodies is contacted with an immunoassay reagent wherein the immunoassay reagent comprises one or more tumor marker proteins prepared from a bodily fluid from a body cavity or space"; "Hanash fails to acknowledge the significance of using tumor marker proteins that are obtained from a body cavity or excretion of a cancer patient."

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1643

Hanash teaches immunoassay methods for detecting autoantibodies in samples against cancer or tumor-derived family of S100 proteins, where the S100 proteins are obtained from bodily fluids or a wide variety of protein mixtures containing S100 proteins, for example, at p. 6, lines 3-16:

“sera and other biological fluids in which *secreted* proteins localize can be used to screen for increased levels of protein expression”;

at p. 6, lines 17-20:

“In a specific embodiment of invention, any member of the S100 protein family can be purified and utilized to screen a subject's serum for the presence of circulating autoantibodies to such protein antigens, by means of sensitive and rapid immunoabsorbent assays or by other procedures”;

at p. 7, lines 3-4:

“In accordance with the invention, measurement of levels of S100 proteins in serum or body fluids can be used for the early diagnosis of diseases such as cancer”;

at p. 10, lines 10-21:

“The present invention is demonstrated by way of example wherein elevated levels of an S 100 protein was detected in serum samples derived from cancer subjects. In particular, increased levels of S100-A9 were detected in serum samples derived from colon and lung patients. In addition, S100-A7 and S100-A8 proteins were shown to be secreted by breast cancer cells, which provide the basis for diagnostic and prognostic assays for breast cancer. The detection and/or quantitative measurement of S 100 proteins in serum or other body fluids can be used in screening of subjects who are at risk for developing certain types of cancers or other proliferative disorders in which the S100 proteins are over expressed. In addition, qualitative differences in the pattern of occurrence in serum or biological fluids of different members of the S100 family of proteins can be used as a screening, diagnostic or prognostic indicator of cancer or cancer risk.”

Hanash discloses four S100 proteins, specifically, S 100-AG, S 100-A7, S 100-A8 and S100-A9, and using these isolated proteins in immunoassays for detection of autoantibodies (Example 7). Hanash discloses using the methods for detection and quantitative measurement of S100 autoantibodies and in screening subjects for risk of cancer or other proliferative diseases (p. 6, lines 9-12) or for the early diagnosis of diseases such as cancer or monitoring of autoantibody levels to prognostically to stage the progression of the disease (p. 11, lines 1-4) or monitoring the efficacy of various therapeutic treatments for cancer (p. 4, line 1 p. 5, line 1).

One skilled in the art could readily envisage that the body fluids or biological fluids of Hanash could be obtained from a body cavity or space where any of the disclosed cancers is present, was present or is associated within. Additionally, the claims are not limited to or nor do they define the meaning of “a body cavity or space” much less where the compartment is defined, for example, the circulatory system from where serum or plasma are assayed.

For example, Hanash teaches that breast cancer cells secrete S100-A7 and S100-A8 proteins (p. 10, line 13-15) thus secretion of the tumor marker into a compartment associated with the cancer such as a duct or cyst or hydrocoele would be inherent to the pathology of the disorder and obtaining the bodily fluid well within ordinary skill. Thus contrary to Applicant's assertion, in Example 7 Hanash shows that a tumor antigen can be prepared where the tumor proteins are separated and isolated by 2-D gel electrophoresis followed by membrane transfer and blotting with serum from a patient to determine the presence of autoantibodies. Finally, Applicants claims are not limited as how a tumor antigen protein is “prepared” or what constitutes a prepared antigen in order to patentably distinguish the claimed method from Hanash.”

Applicants' allegations on pp. 1-2 of the Response of 3/5/09 have been considered and are not found persuasive. Applicants allege “Hanash mention the use of isolated S 100 proteins for the detection of autoantibodies, but fails to describe the source from where these S 100 proteins have been isolated. Claim 1 has been

Art Unit: 1643

amended to specify that the tumor marker proteins are prepared from a bodily fluid from a body cavity or space in which a tumor is or was present; and one skilled in the art would understand from the present specification that the term body cavity or space does not include the circulatory system.

Response to Arguments

A) For purposes of brevity, the Examiner has set forth above the examiner's comments from the previous Office Action. Applicants are invited to review the passages cited by the Examiner showing where Hanash teaches isolating (preparing) tumor antigens from sera, bodily fluids and other biological fluids.

The instant rejected claims do not exclude or distinguish serum obtained from the circulatory system from the instant claimed "body cavity or space". The specification teaches on p. 2 at lines 32-40:

"Autoantibodies are naturally occurring antibodies directed to an antigen which an individual's immune system recognises as foreign even though that antigen actually originated in the individual. They may be present in the circulation as circulating free autoantibodies or *in the form of circulating immune complexes consisting of autoantibodies bound to their target tumour marker protein.*" [examiner's italics]

Thus according to this passage, the ordinary artisan would interpret tumor marker proteins much less those complexed with the auto-antibody as in the circulating form, whereas on p. 8 at lines 37-40 the specification teaches:

"For the avoidance of doubt bodily fluids derived from a body cavity or space" do not include fluids derived from the systemic circulation, such as whole blood or serum."

Art Unit: 1643

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the negative proviso for fluids derived from the systemic circulation) are not recited in the rejected generic claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B) Hanash teaches protein separation on 2-D gels and would therefore result in the isolation and separation of a tumor marker from an immunoglobulin (Examples 6 and 7). Hanash teaches solubilizing whole tissue samples from cancer subjects using a solubilization cocktail prior to running the 2-D gels for protein separation that would result in a bodily fluid from a space in which a tumor is found. Therefore, any solubilized cancer tissue homogenate of Hanash would most broadly read on the Claim 1 limitation where the tumor proteins are "prepared from a bodily fluid from a body cavity or space" containing the tumor.

C) Hanash teaches tumor infiltrates and proteins secreted by tumors into bodily fluids on p. 17, lines 1-6:

"A major determinant of the potential of a protein synthesized by tumors to be detected in serum and other biological fluids is its secreted nature. The features of a protein that determine whether it is secreted by cells remains poorly understood. Factors that affect secretory process may depend on the occurrence of post- translational modifications in the protein as well as the activation of certain signaling pathways."

The rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. The provisional rejection of Claims 1-8, 11, and 12 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 8 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/417,633 (“the ‘633” application; US 20030232399) in view of Robertson et al. (WO 99/58978; published November 18, 1999; cited in the PTO form-892 of 9/27/06) is maintained.

On p. 8 of the Response of 3/5/09 Applicants defer responding to the rejection until allowable subject matter in the ‘633 application is established. The rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1643

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***Enablement***

10. The rejection of Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 (and new Claims 39-44) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the use of the method for detecting any autoantibody against just any tumor antigen for just any cancer, or detecting any autoantibody against just any tumor antigen for just any early neoplastic or early carcinogenic change in asymptomatic patients, or detecting any autoantibody against just any tumor antigen is measuring the recurrence of the cancer or in assessing the prognosis for a treatment therapy.

For purposes of review, the rejection was set forth in the Office Action of 10/1/08 as follows:

"Nature of the invention/ Skill in the art"

The claims are drawn to a method of detecting autoantibodies in a subject by determining a complex formed between a tumor antigen and an autoantibody present in the body fluid and the use of said method in detecting cancer. The invention is in a class of invention which the CAFC has characterized as "the unpredictable arts such as chemistry and biology." *Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high, generally that of a PhD or MD.

Breadth of the Claims

Applicants broadly claim a method of detecting autoantibodies to tumor marker proteins prepared from a bodily fluid from a body cavity or space in which a tumor is or was present or associated with in one or more cancer patients comprising contacting a sample of bodily fluids from said subject with one or more tumor markers selected from and determining the presence or absence of said autoantibodies by complex formation with the tumor marker proteins in said bodily fluids, whereby the presence of said complexes is indicative of autoantibodies to the tumor markers (Claim 1). The claims are further drawn to using the method described above, for detecting cancer (Claim 3), monitoring cancer progression or other neoplastic disease (Claim 4), detecting of early neoplastic or early carcinogenic change in asymptomatic patients (Claim 5), screening for a risk of developing cancer (Claim 6), monitoring the response of a patient to an anti-cancer treatment (Claim 7), and/or detecting a recurrent cancer in a subject already having undergone anti-cancer treatment (Claim 8). Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 3, respectively, and are drawn to the kind of bodily fluid from which the one or more tumor marker proteins are obtained.

Disclosure in the specification/ Working examples

The specification teaches that the instant invention relates to the use of a panel assay for the detection of autoantibodies which uses a panel of tumor marker-related antigens, wherein the panel is tailored to detect a particular cancer, or a cancer at a particular state of development (page 17, lines 13-18). With regards to the markers, the specification teaches that preferred markers include c-erbB2, MUC1, Myc, ras, p53, BRCA1, BRCA2, APC, CA125, PSA, CEA and CA19.9 (p. 17, line 25 to page 18, line 7). The specification further provides the following working examples utilizing MUC1 and MUC16 for the detection of autoantibodies of cancer patients:

Art Unit: 1643

Example 4 (working) serum from a patient with pleural effusions and serum from a patient with advanced breast cancer showed auto-reactive antibodies against MUC1 (Figure 4) compared to normal controls (Figure 5). Serum from patients with ovarian masses and ascites from a patient with breast cancer showed auto-reactive antibodies against MUC16 antigen (Figure 6).

Example 7 (working) MUC1 protein purified from pooled ascetic fluid and pleural effusion from patients with advanced breast cancer showed the protein to be as reactive to autoantibodies as the individually isolated MUC 1 protein (Figures 10 and 11).

Thus, while the specification clearly sets forth the presence of autoantibodies in a patient to MUC1 and MUC16 and using purified proteins for MUC1 and MUC16 in a panel assay for detecting cancer, the specification appears to be silent on the presence of autoantibodies to just any tumor antigen found in any bodily fluid from any body cavity or space and whether the presence of autoantibodies to these tumor antigens, alone or in combination, can be used for the detection of any cancer, monitoring any cancer progression or other neoplastic disease, detecting of early neoplastic or early carcinogenic change in asymptomatic patients, screening for a risk of developing any cancer, monitoring the response of a patient to any anti-cancer treatment, and/or detecting any recurrent cancer in a subject already having undergone any anti-cancer treatment. As such, if there is no correlation, then the examples do not constitute working examples. While it is understood that the absence of working examples should never be the sole reason for rejecting claims as being broader than an enabling disclosure, the criticality of working examples in an unpredictable art, such as the treatment of cancer, is required for practice of the claimed invention.

Quantity of experimentation

The quantity of experimentation in the areas of cancer diagnosis utilizing autoantibodies is extremely large given the unpredictability associated with only subsets of patients with a tumor developing a humoral-based autoantibody response to a particular antigen and the lack of knowledge pertaining to the presence of autoantibodies to any cancer-associated antigen being indicative of a particular cancer.

State of the prior art/ Unpredictability of the art

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could recognize that the use of autoantibodies as serological markers for cancer diagnosis is an interesting concept because of the general absence of these autoantibodies in normal individuals and non-cancer conditions. For example, Stockert et al. (J. Exp. Med. 1998; 187: 1349-1354) teaches that there are a variety of known immunogenic human tumor antigens which generally fall into one of the following categories" (a) cancer-testis antigens; (b) antigens coded for by mutated genes, e.g., p53 and DCK4; (c) differentiation antigens, e.g., tyrosinase and Melan-A; (d) amplified gene products, e.g., Her2/neu and carbonic anhydrases; and viral antigens, e.g., retrovirus, HPV and EBV. In particular, Stockert et al. teach that a survey of sera from 234 cancer patients showed autoantibodies to NY-ESO-1 in 19 patients, to MAGE-1 in 3, to MAGE-3 in 2, and to SSX2 in 1; and no reactivity in sera from 70 normal individuals (page 1351, Table 2). Likewise, Zhang et al. (Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 2003; 12: 136-143) examined the reactivity's of several hundred sera from patients with six different types of cancer to a mini-array of seven selected tumor associated antigens (page 137, 1st column, 1st paragraph). Interestingly, Zhang et al. found that the frequency of antibodies to any individual antigen rarely exceeded 15 to 20%, but with the successive addition of antigens to the panel, there was a stepwise increase in the percentage of positive reactors to between 44 and 68% against a combined panel of seven antigens (page 137, 1st column, 1st paragraph). More recently, Casiano et al. (Molecular & Cellular Proteomics 2006; 5: 1745-1759) lists over 40 candidate tumor associated antigens (TAAs) recognized by autoantibodies from prostate cancer patients. In particular, Casiano et al. teach that while tumor associated antigen (TAA) arrays provide a promising and powerful tool for enhancing cancer detecting and treatment; their utility in a clinical setting is currently in its infancy (page 1755, 2nd column, last paragraph). Thus, while these references cited above clearly show that autoimmunity can be associated with cancer in the form of the development of autoantibodies to autologous cellular antigens, the state of the prior art recognizes the unpredictability associated with cancer diagnosis utilizing autoantibodies because only subsets of patients with a tumor develop a humoral response to a particular antigen

The claims are not limited to any kind of tumor antigen panel or any cancer shown to have a correlation with tumor antigen expression and the detection of autoantibodies to the tumor antigen protein. However, if the ordinary artisan were to consider the art for any class of tumor antigens, using CYFR 21-1, annexin I and annexin II as examples, the state of the prior art at the time the invention was made recognizes that each represent diagnostic markers for a variety of cancerous conditions, as well as non-cancerous conditions. Both Steiber et al. (Cancer 1993; 72: 707-713) and Muraki et al. (Cancer 1996, 77: 1274-1277) found high levels of CYFR-1 in the sera of patients suffering from lung cancer. In addition to being a marker for lung cancer, Muraki et al. also teach that CYFRA 21-1 is useful as a tumor marker for breast carcinoma and gynecological malignant neoplasms, and further, has been

Art Unit: 1643

reported to be present at high levels in benign respiratory diseases, pulmonary tuberculosis, and intestinal pneumonia (page 1277, 1st column, last 2 full paragraphs). Similarly, both annexin I and annexin II have been shown to be expressed in a variety of tumors. For example, Brichory et al. (PNAS 2001: 98; 9824-9829) teach that both annexin I and annexin II are expressed in lung carcinomas (page 9827, Figure 4). Brichory et al. further teach that increased Annexin II expression is also associated with glioblastoma multiforme, pancreatic cancer and acute promyelocytic leukemia (page 9829, 2nd column, paragraph bridging column 1 and column 2). Thus, while the prior art recognizes that CYFRA 21-1, annexin I and annexin II represent diagnostic markers for a variety of cancerous conditions, as well as non-cancerous conditions, only autoantibodies to annexin I and annexin II, and not autoantibodies to CYFRA 21-1, have been taught in the prior art. For instance, Brichory et al. teaches that sera from 54 newly diagnosed patients with lung cancer, 60 patients with other cancers and 61 noncancer controls were analyzed for the presence of autoantibodies to annexin I and annexin II (page 9825, Table I). Specifically, Brichory teaches that sera from more than half of the patients with lung cancer exhibited autoantibodies to annexin I and/or annexin II, but only autoantibodies to Annexin II were found only in lung cancer patients in our series, whereas annexin I autoantibodies were observed in a few patients with other cancers. Thus, while the studies conducted by Brichory et al. clearly suggest a correlation between some patients with lung cancer and the presence of autoantibodies to annexin I and/or annexin II, the percentage of patients having such autoantibodies is small compared to the total population and does not appear to suggest that the presence would be indicative of cancer (emphasis added).

A similar analogy can be made for the class of MUC1 or MUC16 cancer antigens and autoantibodies in detecting any disorder much less the correlation between the antigen expression, presence of autoantibody and the disease type. As an example, Treon et al. (Blood 96(6):3147-3153 (2000)) teach that there is an inverse relationship between soluble MUC1 expression in serum and the level of detectable IgM and IgG autoantibody in patients with multiple myeloma. The studies of Treon teach both IgM and IgG antibodies to MUC1 were detected in MM patients, however, the mean levels of both IgM- and IgG-circulating antibodies were lower than those detected in health humans (Table 2), soluble MUC1 were significantly higher in MM patients versus health patients, and mean soluble MUC1 levels were inversely related to mean anti-MUC1 antibody levels among MM patients and healthy patients (Table 1) (p. 3151, Col. 1, ¶1). Thus the value in detecting autoantibodies at least against MUC1 tumor antigen in MM patients would not have been correlative with disease presence nor could detecting MUC1 antibodies in any cancer patient as instantly claimed provide a basis for detection of any cancer, monitoring any cancer progression or other neoplastic disease, detecting of early neoplastic or early carcinogenic change in asymptomatic patients, screening for a risk of developing any cancer, monitoring the response of a patient to any anti-cancer treatment, and/or detecting any recurrent cancer in a subject already having undergone any anti-cancer treatment.

As to correlating disease specificity with the detection MUC 16 (CA125), Szekanecz et al. (Ann. NY Acad Sci 1108:359-371 (2007) Abstract) teaches that the tumor antigen, CA125 (MUC16) is increased (10.8%) in patients serum with rheumatoid arthritis measured by immunoassay compared to controls (7.1%). Thus not only is MUC 16 expressed in serum of normal subjects but to a greater extent in a cancer-unrelated disorder. These studies establish that there is no strict correlation between MUC 16 tumor markers in a body cavity from a subject and the correlation to cancer. Still further, it is even less tenable how the detection of autoantibodies would be a diagnostic indicia for cancer under these circumstance.

In the instant case, if autoantibodies to MUC1 and/or MUC16 are to be considered as a surrogate for a disease state, a specific disease state must be identified in some way with the molecule. There must be some pattern that would allow the autoantibodies to MUC1 and/or MUC16 to be used in a consistent, specific, predictable and verifiable diagnostic manner for a particular disease. For example, as noted above, those of skill in the art recognize that the antigens MUC1 and MUC16 have been individually taught to be variable insofar as their correlative accuracy in diagnosing any kind of cancer. In the absence of any correlation between the instant claimed autoantibodies with any known disease or disorder, any information obtained from various expression profiles in both normal and diseased tissue only serves as the basis for further research on the observation itself. Therefore, absent evidence of the autoantibodies presence including the correlation to a diseased state, one of skill in the art would not be able to predictably use the antigen in any diagnostic setting without undue experimentation. Autoantibody assays against a panel of antigens could be used as an aid to art-recognized, standardized cancer detection/monitoring procedures but as a stand alone diagnostic, the claimed method is not enabled.

Conclusion

Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the lack of guidance provided in the specification for correlating success, and the negative teachings in the prior art balanced only against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the method of the claim as written.

Art Unit: 1643

Applicants allegations on p. 9 of the Response of 3/5/09 have been considered and are not found persuasive. Applicants allege "The examples of the present application describe the preparation of several tumor marker proteins, such as MUC1, MUC16, and c-myc. Sources of antibodies for purification of numerous other tumor marker proteins are provided on page 38 of the present specification."

Response to Arguments

Arguments of counsel alone are not found to be sufficient in overcoming the enablement rejection (MPEP 2144.03).

The examiner cited several art references explaining the difficulty in predicting correlation between the presence of MUC1 and MUC6 autoantibodies and being able to distinguish a cancer from a non-cancer because the references taught that MUC1 and MUC6 autoantibodies were found in cancerous and non-cancerous diseases alike. Further, none of the elected generic claims are even drawn to a tumor antigen that is strictly and uniquely associated with a cancer and for which autoantibodies are detected. None of the method claims are drawn to using some other art-recognized clinical criteria or markers for a particular cancer that would exclude non-cancerous disorders otherwise associated with co-expression of autoantibodies and the same target antigen.

Further, Applicants have not addressed the issue of overcoming tolerance in those instances where the tumor antigen is found to be expressed in both normal tissues and cancerous tissues, for example, CD20. CD20 is ordinarily found on some populations of B cells but overexpressed in B cell malignancies, and therefore in order

Art Unit: 1643

to generate an autoantibody, one would seemingly have to overcome tolerance to CD20. The same applies to the myriad antigens and autoantibodies encompassed by the instant claims. Applicants have not shown and the prior art does not support overcoming tolerance to any expressed tumor antigens for any cancer to the extent that auto-antibodies are generated much less that they can be used as an indicia for a predictable cancer detection methods.

The ordinary artisan would not have been reasonably apprised of how to practice using the methods absent further detailed and undue experimentation in order to determine a) the correlation for autoantibodies and cancer specific expression of any tumor antigen or b) the presence of autoantibodies against antigens found on both normal and cancerous tissues. The rejection is maintained.

New Grounds for Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-8, 11, 12 and 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson et al. (WO 99/58978, published 1999, cited in the IDS of 1/13/09).

Art Unit: 1643

The interpretation of Claims 1-8, 11, and 12 is of record. New Claims 39-44 are interpreted as being drawn to the method where the tumor marker protein is isolated by protein purification techniques (Claim 39), the fluid samples are pooled from patients for protein purification (Claim 40), the isolated antibody is substantially free from immunoglobulin (Claim 41), the bodily fluid is not from systemic circulation (Claim 42) and is not whole blood or serum (Claim 43) and where the bodily fluid is produced as a result of the disease process or presence of cancer cells (Claim 44).

Robertson teach a method of detecting an autoimmune antibody response to a mammal to circulating tumor marker proteins or tumor cells expressing said tumor marker proteins, which method comprises steps of contacting a sample of bodily fluids obtained from a space associated with a cancer with a panel of two or more distinct tumor marker antigens and determining the presence or absence of complexes of said tumor marker antigens bound to autoantibodies present in said sample of bodily fluids, wherein the presence of said complexes is indicative of an immune response (page 5, lines 2-21). The tumor proteins are taught as being purified from patient fluids such as for example, in Example 1 and 2. The WO reference teaches examples of bodily fluids which may or may not be whole blood or serum from systemic circulation (p. 8, lines 6-12), or specifically obtained from a cavity or space including pleural effusion, ovarian cyst and colon polyps (Fig. 11; p. 45, lines 14-15) and which may be pooled from different patients (Example 1).

With regards to the panel of tumor markers, the WO document teaches that the panel includes, but is not limited to, MIUC1, c-erbB2, c-Myc, p53, ras, BRCA1, BRCA2,

Art Unit: 1643

APC, PSA and CA125 (page 8, lines 1-20), and tailoring the tumor marker antigens with regard to a particular application (p. 10, line 11- to p. 11, line 25).

Moreover, the WO document teaches that the method is useful in a variety of clinical situations such as in the detection of primary or secondary (metastatic) cancer, in screening for early neoplastic or early carcinogenic change in asymptomatic patients or identification of individuals 'at risk' of developing cancer (particularly breast cancer, bladder cancer, colorectal cancer or prostate cancer) in a population or asymptomatic individuals, in the detection of recurrent disease in a patient previously diagnosed as carrying tumour cells who has undergone treatment to reduce the number of tumour cells or in predicting the response of an individual with cancer to a course of anti-cancer treatment (page 9, lines 17-30 and page 31, lines 21 +). The WO document further teaches a method of determining the immune response of a patient to two or more circulating proteins or to tumor cells expressing said tumor maker proteins and identifying which tumor marker elicits the strongest immune response (page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 19). Finally, the WO reference teaches isolating the protein by protein purification techniques including immunoaffinity separation where the eluted protein fraction is free from immunoglobulin (Example 1 and 2).

Conclusion

12. No claims are allowed.
13. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 1/13/09 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynn Bristol whose telephone number is 571-272-6883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:00, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lynn Bristol/
Examiner, Art Unit 1643
Temporary Full Signatory Authority